

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/659,240	09/09/2003	Gerald H. Negley	5308-310	3504	
7590 09/06/2005 Mitchell S. Bigel Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, DAO H		
P.O. Box 37428			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Raleigh, NC 27627			2818		

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/659,240	NEGLEY ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dao H. Nguyen	2818				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 08/11/2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In 						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	-	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	It before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:			,			

David Nelms **Supervisory Patent Examiner** Technology Center 2800

The Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. For example, with regard to the arguments relating to the reference of Taskar et al., as shown in figs. 2-3, the nanophosphor downconverter 13 clearly has a hemispherical shape, or dome-shaped, for at least at the outer surface. Furthermore, the terms "dome" or "dome-shaped" defined in the instant application refers to structures either with or without hemispherical shape(s), or/and including structures with surface(s) other than hemispherical (pape 5, lines 5-10). In the teaching of Taskar, the downconverter 13 has an inner surace which creates a cavity where the LED 11 (which inherently can have various shapes) being installed (col. 8, lines 58-63). Accordingly, the downconverter 13 of Taskar does have a dome-shaped inner surface and a dome-shaped outer surface. In addition, the shell 14 of Taskar is a molded shell, and is filled with composite of gel or liquid (which are transparent) (col. 9, lines 25-32). Therefore, the region between the outer surface of the shell 14 and the outer surface of the downconverter 13 should be a solid region, such region as a whole creates the shell. Hence, clearly the shell is formed with an inner surface directly on the dome-shaped downconverter 13. Furthermore, both inner and outer surfaces of the shell 14 are of hemispherical shapes. Therefore, it is definitely a dome-shaped shell.

David Nelms
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800